92RF8480

EGEG ROCKY FLATS

JIC		
, 2112 A	1	
N HS	1	1
ETMOH DE	1	-
ARNIVAL G.J.	1	-
OPP. R.D	,	
AVIS, J.G.	Ī	

- FRERA, D.W. | OSDWIN P | OSDWIN

FESH IN IX
FESTER A W

EDONALD MM I ORGAN RV IX

WANSON E.H.

MAN K.G.

EBE JS

MINSON R.B. IV

LSON, J.M.

NE J.O.

inoff FHX adv CFX son EAX

Ebwee REX

AND Trok OF

SLASSIFICATION:

ONFIDENTIAL | ECRET | |

THORIZED CLASSIFIER
SIGNATURE
applicable
Classifinat
on office

exemption exemption

76-RF 79:

C I PARTIAL (177)

RAPPROVALS: KMM:

: (77)

B & TYPIST INITIALS

EG&G ROCKY FLATS, INC. TO BOX 464, GOLDEN, COLORADO 80402-0464 + (303) 900-7000

July 22, 1992

92-RF-8480

Terry A. Vaeth Manager DOE, RFO

Attn: J. K. Hartman

OPERABLE UNIT NO. 8 FIELD SAMPLING PLAN - JMK-0709-92

Ref: J. K. Hartman Itr (7722) to J. M. Kersh, EG&G Surface Water and Sediment Field Sampling Plan, July 16, 1992

In response to the above-referenced letter, EG&G Environmental Management Department (EM) has prepared the attached outline for a Field Sampling Plan (FSP) for surface water and sediment sampling for the Operable Unit Number 8 (surface water) RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) at the Rocky Flats Plant. This outline is for a FSP which combines all surface water and sediment sampling for Operable Units (OUs) 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14 into one FSP for the Protected Area (PA) using all available surface water and sediment quality data.

The requested summary of all existing surface water and sediment data is not included herein, because your request provided insufficient time to prepare an adequate data summary. EM estimates that approximately 6 weeks would be required to produce a data summary. This activity is included in the attached schedule and cost estimation.

EM recognizes that an integrated approach to data collection for these OU investigations is necessary, and EM is taking steps to ensure that integration. However, EM does not recommend formal alteration of the existing Work Plans for the PA OUs. A preliminary analysis of the costs, schedules, and programs/activities that would be impacted by a formal change in scope for the PA OUs leads us to the conclusion that the marginal benefit does not warrant the substantial cost and schedule delays.

Change Control

Because the requested effort would constitute a major change in the scope of the OU 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14 Work Plans and field activities, it would be prudent to jointly agree on the changes with EG&G, DOE/RFO, USEPA, and CDH to ensure that the regulators are aware of and concur with the impacts of this proposed FSP preparation. After the scope of the changes for each OU are determined, the Plant Change Control Board would have to approve the transfer of funding from OUs 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14 to OU 8 for use by Surface Water along with additional funding from Management Reserve. We estimate three to four weeks for completion of the Change Control process.

Approach

Two approaches have been considered for this effort: in-house FSP preparation and subcontracted FSP preparation. Both approaches would be costly (\$600K-\$900K). Attached for your information is

A-0U12-000095



Terry A. Vaeth July 22, 1992 92-RF-8480 Page 2

an estimate of the additional funding required for preparation of the Surface Water FSP for OU 8 only. Additional funding (approximately 2-3 times the cost of OU 8) would be required to modify the OU 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14 Work Plans.

In-house FSP preparation would be quicker and avoid the six week procurement delay required for the subcontracted preparation. However, neither of these optimistic schedules (attached) would deliver the FSP by the September 28, 1992 IAG milestone for completion of the Final Phase I RFI/RI Work Plan for OU 8. A two- to four-month delay would occur.

Impacts of Requested FSP Preparation

Because in-house preparation of the FSP would unacceptably impact environmental protection and restoration program management capabilities and schedules, EM would use the subcontracted approach to develop the FSP. Nevertheless, other IAG schedule delays would occur, such as:

- 1. Changing the scheduled implementation of OU 9 and OU 10 activities in order to rewrite the agency-approved OU 9 and OU 10 Work Plans;
- 2. Changing the scheduled completion of the Surface Water, OU 12, OU 13, and OU 14 Work Plans to accommodate FSP changes; and
- 3. Delay in the scheduled start of field activities for OU 4.

Additionally, preparation of several DOE deliverables would be delayed. These include:

- 1. South Interceptor Ditch Soil and Sediment Erosion Study (ERD:JLP:5476);
- 2. Preparation of a Surface Water and Sediment Monitoring Program Summary Document (WMED:GWL:3613); and
- 3. Update of the Terminal Pond Water Quality Evaluation for Radionuclide Discharge (Section 12 of IAG).

Furthermore, pursuit of this self-imposed requirement with its attendant IAG delays could weaken DOE's position for potential IAG renegotiations.

Current Approach

EM recognizes the necessity of an integrated approach to surface water and sediment monitoring for the PA OUs. This integration already is inherent in the interaction between the Surface Water Division (SWD) and the Remediation Programs Division (RPD) to implement surface water and sediment monitoring for RFI/RI activities.

Comprehensive PA OU monitoring can be accomplished through an integrated SWD-RPD program. This program can be developed informally by incorporating individual OU Work Plan requirements into a single program within the SWD without preparation of additional formal planning documentation.

Terry A. Vaeth
July 22, 1992
92-RF-8480
Page 3

To facilitate program integration, a working group consisting of SWD and RPD representatives will develop integrated monitoring schedules for the PA OUs. A chairman for this working group will be designated as a single point of contact to report schedules to DOE/RFO. The SWD-RPD interaction will continue to grow to accommodate OU monitoring and data analysis needs as OU Work Plans are prepared and implemented.

Funding for this integrated monitoring program will be shared by each OU by listing multiple charge account numbers on purchase requisitions instead of presenting major changes of scope to the Plant Change Control Board.

In summary, EG&G recommends continuation of the current informal SWD-RPD interaction regarding surface water and sediment monitoring. We believe the approach described above will achieve the desired results without the cost, schedule, and programmatic impacts of changing the individual OU Work Plans.

If you have questions about the materials presented herein, please contact M. B. Arndt at extension 8509, B. D. Peterman at extension 8659, or K. M. Motyl at extension 8602, all of Environmental Management.

J. M. Kersh, Associate General Manager Environmental and Waste Management EG&G Rocky Flats, Inc.

GAW:vbs BDP:dmf

Orig. and 1 cc - T. A. Vaeth

Attachments: As Stated (2)

CC.

F. R. Lockhart - DOE, RFO B. K. Thatcher, Jr. - DOE, RFO

DRAFT OUTLINE FOR RFI FIELD SAMPLING PLAN FOR SURFACE WATER AND SEDIMENT DATA COLLECTION

OBJECTIVES

1

- 11. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE
 - A. Sampling Rationale
 - B. Analytical Rationale
 - C. Relevant Studies of OUs located in the Protected Area
 - D. Data Compilation
 - a. Monitoring Programs
 - b. Data Sources
 - c. Application
 - E Surface Surveys
 - a. Radiation Surveys
 - b. Surficial Soil Surveys
 - c. Drainage Patterns
- III. SAMPLING DESIGN AND LOCATIONS
 - A. Individual Hazardous Substance Site Overview
 - 1. Potential Contaminants of Concern
 - 2. Contaminant Fate and Transport

1/-

- B. Sitewide Monitoring Program Locations
 - 1. Locations
 - 2. Data Analysis Plan
- C. Event-Related Monitoring Locations
 - 1. Locations
 - 2. Sampling and Data Analysis Plan
- III. D. Building Sumps and Footing Drains
 - 1. Locations
 - 2. SWD Drain Study
 - 3. Sampling and Data Analysis Plan
 - E 750 Pad and 750 Culvert Monitoring
- IV. SAMPLE COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS
 - A. Sample Design
 - B. Analytical Requirements
 - C. Sample Containers and Preservation
 - D. Sample Handling and Documentation
 - E Standard Operating Procedures
- V. DATA MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING
- VI. FIELD QC PROCEDURES

1-

Estimated Direct Labor-Gosts for OUS Eurface-Water and Sediment Field Sampling Plan Prep Scenario #1--In-House Proparation Cost per Hour Cost Hours Activity 480 72.11 34612.8 Scoping with DOE, EPA, CDH 160 72.11 11537.6 Change Control 20 72.11 1442.2 Accumulate Data 72.11 11537.6 Data Cleanup/Input 160 Review Existing Work Plans 320 72.11 23075.2 72.11 17306.4 240 Analyze Data 72.11 34612.8 Write Field Sampling Plan 480 480 72.11 34612.8 Review Field Sampling Plan 160 72.11 11537.6 Rewrite Field Sampling Plan EPA. CDH Review 8 72.11 576.88 Rewrite as per EPA, CDH 80 72.11 5768.8 Final Submittal to EPA,CDH 40 72.11 2884.4 189505.08 Total: Scenario #2--Subcontractor Preparation Cost Per Hour Activity Hours Cost 72.11 480! 34612.8 Scoping with DOE, EPA, CDH 11537.6 Change Control 160 72.11 1442.2 20 72.11 Accumulate Data 72.11 11537.61 Data Cleanup/Input 160 2884.4 72.11 Procurement 40 800 120 96000 Subcontractor Preparation 480 72.11 34612.8 Review Field Sampling Plan 240001 Subcontractor Rewrite FSP 200 120 72.11 576.88 EPA, CDH Raview 9: Sub Rewrite as per EPA, CDH 80 120 96001 40 Final Submittal to EPA, CDH 72.11 2834.4 229688.68 Total: NOTE: The above estimations account for modification of the existing OU8 Field Sampling Plan. This does not account for modification of Work Plans for OU9, OU10, OU12, OU13, and OU14 Field Sampling Plans. EG&G cost/hour based on 2080 hours per FTE and \$150,000/FTE. Subcontractor cost/hour = \$35/hr X 300% for O.H., G&A, and materials + 10% Profit and Fee.'

Ease 1 of 1

;

1 ...

August | September | October | November | December | Invalidation | November | December | Invalidation | Invali In-House FS, terrioduction Predecessors 11/23.92 5 Oopm 10 10/19:92 5.00pm 6 11/16/92 5 copm 9 9/4/92 5.00pm 3 11/2/92 5 Organ 7 9/21/92 5 00pm 4 8.21.92 5 00pm 9.28.92 8 coam 9/4.92 5.00pm 87/92 5 OOpm Scheduled Start 7/27/92 8 Doum 8/10/92 8 00 mm 7/27/92 8:00 am 8/10/72 8 00 am 9.72.72 8 Warm 7/27/92 8 00 am 9.1.72 8.00 em 9.7 R 92 8 00 a.m. 10-20-92 8:00 am 11/392 8 00em 11/17/92 B 00am Perdew FSP, DOE, RFO OU Managers, SW Program Mar Deta Reviewal from PFEDS, EWF IAG US - Submit Final Workplan Scoping with DOE, EFA COH Final 26 per EPA Comments 25 Newton Existing Workplans Date Clean Up and Input EPA, CDH Pandare 92-RE-Change Control Data Analysis Page WHE FSP Please Is FSP

Production
FSP
In-House
Subcontractor

12/4/92 5 COpm 12

12/1/92 5 topm 11

11/24/92 8 COLIM 12.2.92 8 00sm

Resultment for approval

_						L	August	500	September	_	October		_	Newsember	_	Decirities	3		1. mul.
ç.	Name	8	Duston Schedued Start Scheduled Finish	Scheck fed Finish	Predecessort	7756 872	2 6.9 8/16 8/23	9.6	830 816 8113 820 827	1	10.4 10/11/10/18/10:25	118 10.25	1/1	15 1105 11 52 11 25 11 25 11 25 11 25 11 3 11 3	21100	12.5 12	3155316	Ξ	1:1.101/1
- - -	E₽	.₹				80.000 A	M]		Ì	 	
	Campa Control	₹	8/10/92 8 00 am	9/4.92 5 00pm	_	. 	83430043003000000								····			 .	
'n	Data Retternal from RFEDS, EMF	Å	7/27,92 8 00 mm	87.92 5.00pm	_	N. Colonia	F			••••								. 	
	٩	1	Wita92 Brown	9.4/92 5:00pm	3														
٠,	5 Procurement	ž	\$7,92 8 to arm	10/19:92 5 OOpm	2				The state of the s	2000					••••				
~	5 Subconfractor	ž	102092 8:00em	12/1/92 5.00pm	5.4						_	S. 404. 0		A STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE	Name of the last				
-	7 IAG MS - Submit Final Workplan	8	9,28.92 8 co.am	9/28/92 8:00em		••••		••••		•									
_	8 EGAG DOE Partery	\$	12292 8000	12/15.92 5.ecpm						••••					K	000000000			
	9 Rountle by S.D (Oristnes)	\$	12/16/92 8 00 am	=						••••						Ki.	ESSENSE AND A	د: ٠	
<u>.</u>	In School to EPA COM	2	1/1/93 8 cours	17.93 \$ COpm						••••					••••			1	
=	11 Rewrite as per EPA CDA Comments	<u>3</u>	1/3/93 8 CO #v1	1/14/93 \$ 00pm											•••••			i t.	1 24
~	12 Agreeval	<u>*</u>	1/15.93 8 mam	1/21/03 \$ 000m	=							•	•••		•••				

Summary Milestone ◆ Progress Noncritical English English Critical Project: FSP Production Date; 7/21/92

7/21/92